

and Antonina Albino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6755. A bill for the relief of Andrea Como; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6756. A bill for the relief of Vito Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6757. A bill for the relief of Rosolino Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6758. A bill for the relief of Nicola Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6759. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Armetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6760. A bill for the relief of Marco Valra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6761. A bill for the relief of Antonino Randazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6762. A bill for the relief of Arcangelo Ligotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6763. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Licata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6764. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6765. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Sparaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 6766. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raul Gustavo Fors Docal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6767. A bill for the relief of George Raczkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6768. A bill for the relief of Isabel P. Magno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6769. A bill for the relief of Lourdes Y. Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6770. A bill for the relief of Zenaida

Legaspi Mayuga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6771. A bill for the relief of Paciencia Mallari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 6772. A bill for the relief of Theodore A. R. Khan and his wife, Eileen Karamchand Khan, and their children, Ann Khan, Donald Khan, Ronald Khan, Ben Khan, and Christine Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 6773. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertie P. Welborn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6774. A bill for the relief of Brother Amable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6775. A bill to permit the vessel SS *Bedlow* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade while it is owned by Guarisco Enterprises, Inc.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Public Housing Legislation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. PAUL A. FINO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to require local public housing agencies to ignore certain income in computing income levels and resultant rent levels for tenants in federally aided public housing projects. My bill would require local public housing agencies to exclude from tenants' income such part of any governmental pension increase—Federal, State, and local pensions—which the agency shall find to represent a cost-of-living increase, as well as such income as the tenant family spends for medicare coverage.

One of the greatest difficulties in public housing today is the continual readjustment of tenants' rent levels based on changing income levels. Each time a tenant's income goes up, his rent must go up.

This is particularly unfair as regards the many old people in public housing who live on small social security and other pensions. When these people receive a small pension boost, it is often to cover a rise in the cost of living or the expense of a new program like medicare. This type of pension hike should not be gobbled up in increased public housing rents.

My bill provides that the contract between the Federal Public Housing Administration and the local public housing agency must provide that in calculating tenants' income, and rentals based thereon, the public housing agency must omit the amount spent for medicare coverage and also that part of any pension increase which the agency shall find as corresponding to a rise in the cost of living.

Government pensioners living on small fixed-pension incomes have it hard enough in these inflationary days without

having to see any cost-of-living pension hike they get eaten up by rent boosts. My bill would keep cost-of-living pension hikes and boosts to cover medicare expenses from being counted in income so as to cause public housing rent rises. I think that this exclusion is in the true spirit of the public housing program.

### Armed Aggression Against Rhodesia

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in a secret meeting at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, the Black Nationalist Organization of African Unity has given notice that it expects to present a resolution to the United Nations Organization demanding the use of force to remove the Rhodesian Government.

The meeting being attended by some 56 so-called nations, almost a majority of the General Assembly, we can well expect a rubberstamp approval of the war council's demands at the United Nations.

The immediate question on the lips of every parent in the United States is who will pay the bill and do the fighting and dying? And let us have no more of these Executive orders.

Mr. Speaker, last month I introduced H.R. 5479 calling for an amendment to the U.N. Participation Act. I include the text of H.R. 5479 here for the Members to study:

H.R. 5479

A bill to amend section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to require approval by the Congress of orders, rules, and regulations issued by the President to implement certain decisions of the Security Council of the United Nations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 5 of the United Na-

tions Participation Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which, pursuant to article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations, the Council has decided are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under such charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him and approved by the Congress by appropriate Act or joint resolution, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations, or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States."

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting "and approved by the Congress" immediately after "issued by the President".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to orders, rules, and regulations issued by the President on and after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I also have unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the article as written in the March 5 edition of the New York Times discussing the OAU against Rhodesia matter.

#### AFRICAN UNIT TO ACT ON RHODESIA DRAFT

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA, March 3.—Member nations of the Organization of African Unity have called, in a secret draft resolution, for the United Nations to use force to "topple the rebel regime in southern Rhodesia," it was reported Friday.

Informed sources said the resolution, the strongest of its kind in the memory of observers here had been prepared during secret committee meetings of the organization's ministerial council, which is meeting here this week.

It was considered almost certain of formal passage by the council, which is expected to end its deliberations tomorrow.

The majority of the 56 nations represented at the conference refused today to accept a new, slightly larger administrative budget proposed by the organization's secretary general, Diallo Telli.

Instead they voted to continue the budget at its present level of \$1.9-million a year. The funds are donated by the organization's 38 members. Guinea and Lesotho are absent from the present meeting.

**The Joseph G. Weeda Post 66, Department of the District of Columbia, American Legion**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. JAMES KEE**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 1967*

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening, March 2, 1967, the late Joseph G. Weeda was honored in the Nation's Capitol by the American Legion.

The members of Housing Post No. 66, Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion, were determined to honor the memory of our past post commander, Joseph G. Weeda, who served the American Legion and all veterans so effectively.

Mr. Weeda, who died in 1962, was a prominent Washington attorney and civic leader. In addition to serving as commander of Housing Post No. 66, he held many departmental offices including vice commander and department commander of the Department of the District of Columbia, and at the time of his death, he was serving as national executive committeeman of the department.

In order to fulfill this determination, the members voted at the regular monthly meeting held on February 2, 1967, to change the name of the post to the Joseph G. Weeda Post No. 66.

On March 2, the replacement permanent charter was formally presented to Post Commander Robert Relihan by National Vice Commander Harry V. Klein, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, this was a significant day in the life of the American Legion.

It was a milestone in the history of the Department of the District of Columbia.

It was an historic day in the history of post No. 66.

It is true that the highest recognition within the gift of an American Legion post to one of its members is to give, by majority vote of the members of the post a life membership in the American Legion.

It is equally true, there is no higher recognition within the American Legion than the naming of an American Legion post, by vote of its members, in honor of the memory of a departed comrade.

It was fitting and proper that Mr. Weeda's widow and members of the Weeda family were guests of honor.

In addition to National Vice Commander Klein and Commander Relihan, also participating in the ceremonies were Department Commander Hy Wayne and the national guard of honor, under the auspices of Maj. Harry G. Miller. The entire staff of the department and Gen. Bill Doyle, past department commander of New Jersey, joined friends of the fam-

ily to pay tribute to the memory of this outstanding American citizen. The members of the West Virginia congressional delegation individually expressed their admiration for West Virginia's native son.

Because of the ceremonies in Washington on March 2, the name Joseph G. Weeda will live as long as we have an American Legion.

**American Policy Toward NATO**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 1967*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening, on March 4, 1967, I was privileged to appear on the program entitled "Saturday Seminar," which is broadcast by radio station WOR-AM in New York City.

Seton Hall University at Orange, N.J., has been sponsoring guest appearances on the "Saturday Seminar" shows. On March 4, I was interviewed by Dr. Michael Szaz, professor at Seton Hall, and by my legislative assistant, William van den Toorn. Our discussion concerned American policy toward NATO, and future trends in the alliance.

I have been provided with a question-and-answer transcript of the program, which I will include in the RECORD at this time. My answers to the questions posed summarize my general viewpoint as to the American approach to the alliance.

[From the Saturday Seminar, Mar. 4, 1967, WOR radio, New York City]

**AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD NATO**

Guest: Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN.

Question. There is considerable debate over the so-called disarray and disunity in NATO. Do you believe that the Alliance is disintegrating and losing its purpose?

Mr. HALPERN. As you may know, I made a series of House speeches on this subject last year. It seemed to me then, as it does now, that the purely military factors binding the Alliance are becoming less crucial. Because of the changing world power structure, NATO may be losing some of its post-war credibility.

But I don't think the United States, as the principal ally, should allow the Alliance to fall apart. It can become increasingly important in forging closer political and economic ties between our country and West Europe. It can become a forum for discussing and then implementing a common, unified approach toward the Communist world.

The United States has to take the lead in adjusting the Alliance. And on the whole, I don't think the present Administration has been very effective or imaginative in this regard.

Question. Do you think NATO should play a role in determining the question of nuclear sharing? Should NATO appoint a council on nuclear affairs which, together with the U.S. would plan nuclear policy?

Mr. HALPERN. This question of nuclear sharing has been debated for years. First, we had the idea of the MLF, a multilateral force of ships or submarines, carrying nuclear weapons, manned by mixed European crews. It was a flop. In this connection, I was the first member of the House to pub-

licly express reservations about the idea. The fact was that from the very beginning, the Europeans weren't enthusiastic; and the concept did not really answer the question of nuclear co-decisioning among the Allies.

At present, I think there is a council of the major NATO states which discusses nuclear targeting and such matters. But the United States still possesses exclusive control over the use of nuclear weapons, in the event of war. In my view, a greater degree of nuclear sharing, among our allies, is dependent upon the growth of more intensive political cooperation between us. What I mean is that a greater degree of political unity and consultation between the United States and Europe is essential if we are to earn mutual trust. And trust is a prerequisite to nuclear sharing.

Question. Do you think a non-proliferation treaty will inevitably weaken NATO in that Germany may be prevented from cooperating to the full on nuclear planning?

Mr. HALPERN. This is difficult to answer. In the past, we have tended to stress Germany's military contribution to NATO as the prime vehicle of absorbing her into the Western Alliance. This was a mistake, and I think the United States should re-evaluate this matter.

In a sense, the non-proliferation treaty will reinforce the status quo. And already in this status quo, Germany occupies a principal position, both in the Alliance and as regards Central European politics and relations with the East.

It is nonsense to say that the problems of NATO would be solved if we only shared our nuclear secrets and nuclear determination with the major allies. Nuclear sharing is not the crux of the NATO dilemma. Moreover, there are other means of assuring Germany her proper role in Western decision-making.

I think the Europeans, and especially the Germans, have a legitimate interest and desire to share strategic planning. However, they must understand that this imposes a responsibility to contribute, and only in the case of Germany has this obligation been fulfilled.

I would like to see all the NATO allies debate and then determine the future disposition of American forces in Europe, for instance. This is not solely a German-American problem.

Question. How can NATO help in furthering East-West trade? And is this really desirable?

Mr. HALPERN. As you know, there is a vast disparity between the way Europeans treat the issue of trade with the Soviets and the way we treat it.

This business of dealing with Eastern Europe, of opening up contacts with these countries, is something which all our Western Allies have undertaken. The United States still maintains a rather rigid attitude. This difference of approach is one of the sources of disunity in the Alliance.

The question of East-West trade should be debated within the Alliance. However, I don't think the United States can exercise much leadership unless the President, and particularly the Congress, gives an indication that we are willing to reduce our own institutional barriers.

Question. What do you think of Senator Mansfield's proposal to withdraw contingents of American troops from Europe?

Mr. HALPERN. On the face of it, this is something the United States should consider, over the long run.

However, I don't particularly like the Mansfield approach, which appears arbitrary. At this time, I believe the United States should take the initiative to discuss with our NATO allies, in the NATO councils, what level of American troops in Europe is considered necessary.

Now, Mr. McCloy has been having discreet talks with the Germans and with the British



on off-set purchases. The Kiesinger government in Bonn is much less inclined to follow our orders. The debate on financing our troops abroad should open up formal considerations as to the quantity of American and British forces which are deemed essential for continental security.

But this isn't happening. This Administration has shied away from the real, painful issue. And, it seems to me that if our NATO allies decide that the present American divisions are absolutely necessary for the common defense, then I think our sacrifice in terms of money should be shared. NATO should share the costs. Instead of getting the cooperation of our allies in supporting the costs of maintaining these troops, we went out and demanded German arms purchases in the United States, which is a very circular and somewhat silly and irrelevant method.

Question. Is there any way that we can mend our relations with France? She has pulled out of NATO. Doesn't this really signal the end of the Alliance?

Mr. HALPERN. France withdrew from the integrated command structure. De Gaulle doesn't like the idea of France being drawn into a conflict through the actions of others; he wants France to have complete discretion over the questions of war and peace.

But France remains a member of the Alliance and respects the obligations of the Treaty.

The withdrawal of France typifies what is happening in the world. The lesser powers, which includes France, are finding it increasingly possible to follow independent courses. This is true of the Soviet satellites, for instance.

The old, exclusively military rationale behind NATO, and behind all the post-war coalitions, is losing its applicability. This doesn't mean that defensive alliances, such as NATO, have lost their importance. Certainly, a multilateral agreement on mutual defense is desirable and even essential for Atlantic security.

But there are other common interests among us which are rising to the fore. And NATO can provide a forum for discussing and furthering these interests. The withdrawal of France doesn't mean the end of the Alliance. It does mean that the purely military factors which held the Alliance together are losing their credibility, in the light of changing world conditions.

## Preserving Our Nation's Estuarine Areas

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 6, 1967, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation began hearings on H.R. 25, introduced by subcommittee chairman, JOHN DINGELL, my bill, H.R. 1397, and other legislation to preserve the Nation's valuable estuarine areas.

On September 23, 1961, I introduced H.R. 11236—89th Congress—a bill to establish a Long Island National Wetlands Area covering 16,000 acres of valuable coastal wetlands located on the south shore of Long Island—Hempstead South Oyster Bay. During the hearings on that bill in June 1966, at the suggestion of the committee and for the

purpose of incorporating amendments, I introduced H.R. 15770—89th Congress—to broaden the scope of my original bill by applying its provisions to all valuable estuarine areas selected by the Secretary of the Interior for preservation or restoration. During the hearings, the committee also considered H.R. 13447, introduced by the distinguished chairman of this committee, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL.

Following the hearings this subcommittee and the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported favorably on H.R. 13447, as amended, incorporating the essential features of my bill, H.R. 15770. On October 3, 1966, H.R. 13447 came before the House and the final vote was 208 in favor and 108 opposed. Despite this overwhelming support, the bill failed to pass because a two-thirds vote was required for a suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, consideration of this legislation is particularly important at this time in light of the constant pressures on local governments to consider wetlands and other estuarine areas on the basis of their real estate values rather than their natural resource values.

In the 90th Congress, H.R. 25, sponsored by Chairman DINGELL and my bill, H.R. 1397, which are identical, were introduced and are now the subject of these hearings. The Dingell-Tenzer bills would enable States and local governments to work with the Federal Government to resist pressures from a society growing and expanding at a rapid pace.

The purpose of the Dingell-Tenzer bills is to preserve, protect, develop, restore and make accessible selected parts of the Nation's diminishing estuarine areas which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, outdoor recreation and scenic beauty.

This legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with States and local governments for the permanent management and preservation of publicly owned estuarine areas; to designate national estuarine areas; and to pay all development costs, except development for recreational uses other than hunting and fishing, in which case the Secretary would pay 50 percent of development costs.

In addition, the Secretary is authorized to conduct a 5-year nationwide study of estuaries, and report the results annually to Congress. Privately owned wet lands could be acquired by the Secretary as national estuarine areas only with the consent of Congress.

The Dingell-Tenzer bills provide for cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments, in the nature of a partnership, to preserve for future generations valuable coastal wetland and other estuarine areas. These partnerships impose no Federal control not agreed upon by the parties in negotiating their management agreements. This legislation specifically provides that State hunting and fishing laws relating to fish and wildlife will continue to apply within any national estuarine areas established by the Secretary, and the legislation does not affect the authority of States and local governments to regulate and permit shellfishing. This legis-

lation also removes the objection that privately owned land within a national estuarine area can be purchased with appropriated funds by the Secretary in that such acquisition will not be effective until it is approved by an act of Congress.

A new feature of the legislation is section 12 which prohibits anyone from dredging, filling or excavating any estuary of the United States or the Great Lakes and connecting waterways, unless the Secretary of the Interior issues a permit for such purposes.

This new provision applies to all estuaries, not just national estuarine areas, and represents an effort to place the Department of the Interior—with conservation responsibilities—on an equal footing with the Army Corps of Engineers which now has exclusive jurisdiction in licensing such projects.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would preserve the most valuable estuarine areas of our Nation before it is too late. We have more than 26 million acres of estuarine area left and if we are to preserve our natural resources for future generations, we must begin now.

On Monday, March 6, 1967, the New York Times carried the following editorial which I bring to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1967]

#### PROTECTING THE ESTUARIES

An estuary, where a river's current meets the sea's tide, is a vital zone in the natural world. Here shellfish spawn, marsh birds live and water moves back and forth through bays and inlets as part of nature's own flood-control plan.

Only in recent years has the public come to understand the importance of estuaries. Upstream pollution is ruining clams and oysters along the East Coast and the Gulf of Mexico. Unrestrained dredging and land-fill operations are depriving birds of their breeding places and seriously endangering fish.

Last year, Representative Tenzer of New York sponsored a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with states and local communities for the management and preservation of estuaries and coastal wetlands. The bill also provided for Federal acquisition of such areas if Congress gave specific approval and authorized a research study of the nation's estuaries. Unfortunately, it failed of passage in the House during the rush to adjourn.

Mr. Tenzer has now broadened his bill and reintroduced it. Hearings are scheduled this week by a House Merchant Marine and Fisheries subcommittee, chaired by Representative Dingell of Michigan. The bill's progress is of deep interest to all who realize that estuaries are among this nation's most valuable and most endangered resources.

## A Tribute to the U.S. Office of Education on Its 100th Anniversary

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the year 1967 marks 100 years of the life of the U.S. Office of Education. One hundred



years is a long time; but far from aging, the Office of Education has recently, with Congressional infusions of additional funds, taken on new life. No doubt this reflects recognition by the Nation and Congress of the essential and expanding role of education in our increasingly complex, technological society. So far as I know, no one has expressed this essential role better than President Johnson in his education message to the Congress on January 12, 1965, when, speaking of the need for full educational opportunity, he said:

Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness, for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy, for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government, for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

This Nation has always been interested in education; but until recently, it has not given much support to research in education. According to the U.S. Office of Education's 1966 Digest of Educational Statistics, our estimated total expenditure for education—public and private—in the school year 1965–66 was \$45.1 billion—an awesome sum. Expenditures by the Office of Education for research in education came to about \$100 million; or, approximately, only two-tenths of 1-percent of the total educational expenditure. This may seem small—as indeed it is—but viewed historically, it represents progress. On this centennial of the Office of Education, a brief historical retrospect and current evaluation is in order:

For the first 89 years of its existence—1867–1956—the Office of Education had virtually no research program. Carrying out the mandate of the 1867 enabling act, the Office collected and published highly useful statistics on such matters as enrollments, staff, curriculum, income, expenditures, and school plant; and provided useful bibliographic, consultative, and advisory services. In fiscal 1957 a change took place, when Congress first provided funds to implement the Cooperative Research Act—Public Law 83–531—passed in 1954. The initial appropriation was for only \$1 million. Appropriations for the next 6 years rose by small annual increments to the level of \$7 million—a sum large enough to begin to have some impact, but still woefully small in comparison with the needs and opportunities which extramural research in education presented. The big jump came in fiscal 1966, when—apart from an appropriation of \$20 million earmarked for the construction of research facilities—the operating research budget

for extramural research rose from \$15.8 million to \$50 million.

But the cooperative research program, authorized by Congress in 1954 and first financed in fiscal 1957, has not been the only recent federally supported research program in education. I shall merely mention five others. Two of these were established by the National Defense Education Act of 1958; namely, the section of the act authorizing “research and studies on more efficient methods of teaching” modern foreign languages; and the section requiring the Commissioner of Education to “conduct research and evaluation of projects involving television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication.” Three other legislative authorizations for research are extremely recent: one—Public Law 88–164, passed in 1963—authorizes funds for research on the education of handicapped children; one provides for “research and training programs and experimental, developmental, or pilot programs” in vocational education—Public Law 88–210, also passed in 1963—and the last, contained in the Higher Education Act of 1965—Public Law 89–329—provides for “research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries or the improvement of training in librarianship.”

Originally, these different legislative authorizations for research were administered, for the most part, in separate bureaus of the Office of Education. Now they are all—except for research on education of the handicapped—administered within the Bureau of Research. The advantages of this arrangement, from the viewpoint of efficiency and coordination, appear obvious.

From the small, \$1 million program of fiscal 1957, to the much larger—but still relatively small—\$50 million programs of 1967 is a large jump. The jump has in my judgment been justified both by the usefulness of the research which has been supported, and by the organizational ingenuity displayed by those in charge of administering the program. At present, eight different types of provisions for research and related activities have been set up:

First. Regular project research—the garden variety of extramural research projects.

Second. The small project program—for projects involving \$10,000 or less of Federal support. This program provides funds especially for small institutions, young researchers, speculative ideas, and so forth. It is administered in decentralized fashion, from five field offices.

Third. Related to the small projects program is the consortium research de-

velopment program—CORD—whereby a group of small colleges pool their resources to develop their research potential. There are at present six such consortiums, widely distributed over the Nation.

Fourth. Research and development centers—12 at present. Each center specializes in a given area of research. The centers are designed to focus on major, complex problems requiring a team approach and long sustained effort which individual researchers with short-term grants cannot attack as well. The centers give serious attention to dissemination and field trial or application of findings, as well as research.

Fifth. Educational “laboratories”—21 in number, at present, throughout the Nation. These are separate corporations, each designed to mobilize the abilities and interests of the universities, State departments of education, local school systems, nonprofit agencies and, when feasible, representatives from foundations and industrial groups in its region. The chief function of the laboratories is to stimulate, advise, and help educational systems to accelerate the application of available knowledge and new research. They may also engage in related research activities.

Sixth. State research coordinating units in vocational education—one in each of 44 States, at present. These coordinate local research and demonstration efforts in vocational education and provide consultative assistance to individuals who wish to prepare research proposals in vocational education.

Seventh and eighth. Two other research-related activities of the Office must be mentioned: first, a modern, computerized bibliographic, abstracting, and document-reproduction service called “ERIC”—Educational Research Information Center—and second, a program for the training of educational researchers. Both these programs are of fundamental importance for an effective program of educational research and application of research.

A program must be judged by its works or outputs; and here, merely a quick inspection of the monthly catalog of research abstracts issued by ERIC is sufficient to verify the great fruitfulness of the Office of Education's extramural research program. The organization, activities, and output of the Office of Education's research and dissemination program appear all the more remarkable when it is remembered the program covers, at most, only the last 10 years of the 100-year lifespan of the Office. May the next 10 and 100 years prove equally rewarding.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.—Matthew 5: 9.*

Our Father, we know that by ourselves

we are not adequate for this day, nor are we ready for our responsibilities, nor are we equal to our experiences. By Thy grace we can become adequate, by Thy spirit we can be made ready, and by Thy presence we can be equal to every experience.

As we wait upon Thee in prayer, reveal Thyself anew to us, and come Thou into our hearts. Then with new peace, greater power, and with better perspective may we serve our Nation well this

day and all days. Help us, the Representatives of our people, to see clearly, to choose wisely, and to act courageously, that we may be among the true peacemakers of our time. In the name and spirit of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.